arXiv:1704.00252v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 2 Apr 2017

Z_2 topological order and Majorana doubling in Kitaev Chain

Rukhsan Ul Haq and Louis H. Kauffman

Abstract. The Kitaev chain model exhibits topological order which manifests as topological degeneracy, Majorana edge modes and Z_2 topological invariant of bulk spectrum. This model can be obtained from a transverse field Ising model(TFIM) using the Jordan-Wigner transformation. TFIM has neither topological degeneracy nor any edge modes. The natural question which arises is how is topological order in the Kitaev chain related to Landau order of the spin model. In this paper we make an attempt to answer this question. On the fermionic side we identify an operator which leads to topological order. This operator is not present in spin model and hence there is no topological order. Our construction can be generalized to a parafermion chain model as well. Hence we have identified the algebraic roots of the topological order in Kitaev chain type models. We also propose a new characterization of topological order based on the connection of topological order with topological entanglement which comes from Yang-Baxter solution. We believe that our results will prove very significant in the the theory of topological order, which has attained utmost importance in view of topological quantum computation.

Keywords. Topological order;Kitaev Chain;Clifford algebra;Yang-Baxter equation.

1. Introduction

Landau's symmetry breaking theory has been the paradigm for the classification of phases in condensed matter physics. Magnetic and superconducting orders are the prime examples which have been understood within this paradigm. However, the discovery of the quantum Hall effect gave rise to a counter example for symmetry breaking order. In this case there is no symmetry breaking involved and the classification is based on topology rather than on symmetry. The discovery of topological insulators has added more examples to the list for topological order, although in the latter case the order

is not same as that of the quantum Hall fluid. Topological order in topological insulators and superconductors is called Z_2 topological order because it is associated with a Z_2 topological invariant. Discovery of topological insulators and superconductors has boosted the research in topological order. And more importantly many model Hamiltonians have been shown to exhibit topological order. What is very interesting about these Hamiltonians is that they are quadratic, and hence can be analytically solved. Based on K-theory and Clifford algebras, by now there is full classification for the topological order that arises in these Hamiltonians in various dimensions. This classification came as real breakthrough in understanding topological properties of matter. Nevertheless, the difficult task of taking interactions into considerations is going to take lot more work.

In this paper, we will consider a Kitaev chain Hamiltonian[1] which, though simple and quadratic, has a topological phase in which there are Majorana modes at the edges of the chain. Kitaev employed a Majorana fermion representation to diagonalize the Hamiltonian and showed that there are Majorana edge modes. The Kitaev model is not an entirely new model. It can be obtained from the transverse field Ising model(TFIM) using a Jordan-Wigner transformation. So what Kitaev did is that he took fermions as degrees of freedom instead of spins. This novel point of view opened up the way to understand topological order in a well-known system. TFIM exhibits only Landau order, and the ordered phase arises due to the symmetry breaking of the model. The immediate question which comes to mind is how is Landau order in TFIM related to the topological order, or how does topological order arise in the Kitaev Chain when one maps to a fermionic representation. One important aspect of Kitaev's work is that he considered fermions as degrees of freedom, rather than spins in the TFIM model. But the question is how does the transformation from spin to fermionic representation give rise to topological order? This question has been asked in a recent work[2]. There it is concluded that spectral properties of the two models are same, which we will find below is not correct. Using duality this question has been addressed by [3]. They find that in topological order one gets a non-local order parameter. So one tries to understand topological order from the symmetry point of view and tries to find out whether there are different kinds of symmetry breaking involved in the topological order. In an another work [4] Fendley has come up with an algebraic approach for topological order in a Majorana chain and more generally for a parafermion chain. He identifies an operator which is a Majorana mode operator and its presence leads to topological order. This approach is close to our approach, and below we will show how we have also found an operator which satisfies the same algebra as that of the Fendley operator. We will show in this paper that on the fermionic side, the algebra is larger and hence there are more symmetries and hence more conserved quantities which are non-local as compared to the spin model. We will show that in the Kitaev chain model there is an additional element in

the algebra which had not been taken into consideration by Kitaev. That operator leads to topological degeneracy and edge modes. Hence we answer the question why there is topological order in Kitaev chain and not in its spin equivalent. The strength of our approach is that it can be generalized to parafermion chains as well. Our construction holds good for the interacting case also.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: First, we briefly discuss the Kitaev chain model, its symmetries, and topological order. Then in the next section, we show how the algebra of Majorana fermions is conceptually incomplete, and we present the full Clifford algebra. In Section 4 we compare our results with Fendley's results and show that the operator which we introduce to complete the algebra of Majorana fermions satisfies the same algebra as that of the Majorana edge mode operator of Fendley. Then we briefly show how our construction can be generalized to parafermions as well. In the next section, we discuss the connection between topological order and the Yang-Baxter equation. In the final section, we summarize our results and conclusions.

2. Kitaev p-wave Chain

To study the relation between Landau order and topological order we introduce two Hamiltononians which are related to each other by Jordan-Wigner transformation. Two models are transverse field Ising model(TFIM) and Kitaev p-wave chain model. Following Kitaev we will diagonalize Kiatev chain model using Majorana fermion representation and that way we will show that in its topological phase,Kitaev chain model has Majorana edge model and also topological degeneracy. Majora fermions being very important in our study we will look closely at their algebra and how as a quantum system they are different from the standard(Dirac)fermions.

The Hamiltonian for the transverse field Ising model is:

$$H = -J \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - h_z \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_i^z \tag{2.1}$$

where J is the ferromagnetic exchange constant and h_z is the Zeeman field in the Z direction. This model has Z_2 symmetry, due to which the global symmetry operator commutes with the Hamiltonian.

$$\left[\prod_i \sigma_i^z, H \right] = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

The global symmetry operator flips all the spins. There is a doubly degenerate ground state. This model exhibits two phases which can be understood on the basis of Landau's symmetry breaking theory. There is a ferromagnetically ordered phase which arises when the symmetry of the model is broken.There

is a disordered phase in which symmetry is intact. We will now apply the Jordan-Wigner transformation to this model to map it to a fermionic model which will turn out to be the Kitaev chain model. The Jordan-Wigner transform maps the spin operators into Fermionic ones:

$$c_i = \sigma_i^\dagger(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\sigma_i^z) \quad c_i^\dagger = \sigma_i^-((\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\sigma_i^z) \tag{2.3}$$

$$H = -t\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + h.c.) + \triangle\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} c_i^\dagger c_{i+1}^\dagger + h.c. - \mu\sum_{i=0}^{N} c_i^\dagger c_i$$

where t, Δ, μ are hopping strength,superconducting order parameter and chemical potential respectively. Kitaev employed a Majorana fermion representation to diagonalize this Hamiltonian.

$$c_i = \frac{\gamma_{1,i} - i\gamma_{2,i}}{\sqrt{2}} \quad c_i^\dagger = \frac{\gamma_{1,i} + i\gamma_{2,i}}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{2.4}$$

In the Majorana representation the Hamiltonian gets transformed to:

$$H = it\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(\gamma_{1,i}\gamma_{2,i+1} - \gamma_{2,i}\gamma_{1,i+1}) + i\Delta\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(\gamma_{1,i}\gamma_{2,i+1} + \gamma_{2,i}\gamma_{1,i+1})$$
$$-\mu\sum_{i=0}^{N}(\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_{1,i}\gamma_{2,i}) \tag{2.5}$$

The Hamiltonian has trivial phase and topological phase. Trivial phase is obtained for the choice of parameters: $t = \Delta = 0$. In this case two Majorana fermions at each site couple together to form a complex fermion, and there is no topological phase as there are no Majorana edge modes. Choosing $\mu = 0$ and $t = \Delta$ the Hamiltonian becomes.

$$H = 2it\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\gamma_{1,i}\gamma_{2,i+1} \tag{2.6}$$

We can define a complex fermion:

$$a_i = \frac{\gamma_{2,i+1} - i\gamma_{1,i}}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{2.7}$$

The Hamiltonian becomes:

$$H = \left(t\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i^\dagger a_i - \frac{1}{2}\right) \tag{2.8}$$

We can see that ground state of this Hamiltonian has no a-fermions. But there is more to the story because there are two Majorana fermions which have not been included in the Hamiltonian. Taking them together we can form another fermion which is non-local, residing at the two ends of the chain.

$$a_0 = \frac{\gamma_{1,N} - i\gamma_{2,0}}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{2.9}$$

So there is boundary term H_b corresponding to two Majorana edge modes. Presence of boundary term due to the bulk topology is another feature of topological order in which there is a bulk-boundary correspondence.

$$H_b = \epsilon_0 a_0^\dagger a_0 \quad \epsilon_0 = 0 \tag{2.10}$$

With this boundary term included in the Hamiltonian, we can see that it has a doubly degenerate ground state depending on presence or absence of the edge mode. It is this edge mode which is the feature of the topological phase of Kitaev chain and is related to the topological invariant of the bulk spectrum. The two ground states can be distinguished by a parity operator. They have even and odd parity respectively. $\mid 0\rangle$ has no a_0 fermion and hence an even number of fermions while as $\mid 1\rangle$ has one a_0 fermion and hence odd parity. So the presence of an edge mode gives rise to double degeneracy. This degeneracy is an example of topological degeneracy because it is protected by a topological invariant. Since the topological invariant comes from a particle-hole symmetry which is a discrete symmetry, such topological order has been called *symmetry protected topological order*.

2.1. Majorana fermions versus complex fermions

Majorana fermions can be taken algebraically as building blocks of (standard) fermions. The algebra of Majorana fermions makes them very different from the usual fermions. Fermions obey the Grassmann algebra:

$$\{c_i, c_i^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij} \quad c_i^2 = (c_i^\dagger)^2 = 0 \quad N = c^\dagger c \quad N^2 = N \tag{2.11}$$

where $c^\dagger$,c and N are creation,annihilation and number operator for a fermion.

$$\mid 1\rangle = c^\dagger \mid 0\rangle \quad \mid 0\rangle = c \mid 1\rangle \tag{2.12}$$

$$c \mid 0\rangle = c^\dagger \mid 1\rangle = 0 \tag{2.13}$$

Fermions have a vacuum state. Creation and annihilation operators are used to construct the states of fermions. Fermions have $U(1)$ symmetry, and hence the number of fermions is conserved, and occupation number is a well-defined quantum number. The number of fermions in a state is given by the eigenvalue of the number operator. Here the number operator is idempotent, and hence there are only two eigenvalues:$0, 1$. Also, different fermion operators anti-commute with each other and hence obey Fermi-Dirac statistics.

Majoranas are very different because they are self-hermitian and hence creation and annihilation operators are the same, which means that a Majorana fermion is its own anti-particle. A fermionic vacuum can not be defined for Majorana fermions because there is no well-defined number operator, or in other words the number of Majorana fermions is not a well-defined quantity, and hence not a quantum number which can be used to label Majorana fermions. Majorana fermions don't have $U(1)$ symmetry, and hence a number operator can not be defined for them. However, they have Z_2 symmetry; parity is conserved for Majorana fermions. Majorana fermions also anti-commute

among each other. However, Majorana fermions generate non-abelian braid statistics. They generate a braid group representation.

When taken abstractly Majorana fermions appear to be very unrealistic particles, but physically they can appear as Bogoliubov quasiparticles which exist as zero modes in topological superconductors. They are zero energy solutions of the BdG equation and are different from Majorana spinors which are solutions of the Dirac equation.

For a general choice of parameters, one finds that the Hamiltonian is an antisymmetric matrix and hence has doubled spectrum. For every energy state there is another degenerate eigenstate. So one can say that the presence of particle-hole symmetry turns a Hermitian matrix into a real anti-symmetric matrix which has doubled spectrum. The number of Majorana modes is a topological invariant called the Z_2 invariant, and is given by a Pfaffian of the Hamiltonian.

3. Algebra of Majorana doubling

In this section we will revisit the algebra of Majorana fermions and see that in the way it is usually presented some of the significant higher order products are not used. In the Kitaev paper, the algebra of Majorana fermions is written as

$$\{a_i, a_j\} = 2\delta_{ij} \tag{3.1}$$

This equation defines the Clifford algebra of Majorana fermions. The full algebra is generated by all the ordered products of these operators. For the case of three Majorana fermions the full Clifford algebra is described below:

$$\{1, \gamma_1 = a_1, \gamma_2 = a_2, \gamma_3 = a_3, \gamma_{12} = a_1a_2, \gamma_{23} = a_2a_3, \gamma_{31} = a_3a_1, \gamma_{123} = a_1a_2a_3\} \tag{3.2}$$

The Clifford algebra of three Majorana fermions is 8 dimensional,with these eight independent generators. There are three bivectors γ_{12},γ_{23},γ_{31} and one trivector(also called pseudoscalar) γ_{123}. Bivectors are related to rotations and trivector will turn out to be very important for our discussion on topological order because it is a chirality operator which distinguishes between even and odd parity. We refer to [6] for more discussion on Clifford algebra of spin. However that makes clear how a fermionic system is different from spin system. In that paper the reader will find seeds of the duality between spin(Pauli matrices) and fermions(Clifford algebra).

We ask whether there is a way to understand how topological order arises in the Kitaev chain as we do an algebraic transformation from TFIM. During this transformation, the degrees of freedom or the quasiparticles also get transformed. To answer this question, we revisit the algebra of Kitaev

chain.

In [5] Lee and Wilczek gave illuminating analysis of doubled spectrum of the Kitaev chain model. They showed that the algebra which has been considered for the Kitaev Chain model is conceptually incomplete. Using case of three Majorana fermions which are at the edges of superconducting wires,it is shown that the Hamiltonian of these Majorana fermions has more algebraic structure than anticipated. The difference lies in another Majorana operator which was missed in the Kitaev paper. This Majorana operator has been called *Emergent Majorana* for the reason that it obeys all the properties of a Majorana fermion. We briefly review their analysis here and later on generalize it. Let b_1,b_2 and b_3 are three Majorana fermions which can occur at the ends of three wires.They obey Clifford algebra:

$$\{b_j, b_k\} = 2\delta_{jk} \tag{3.3}$$

We can write down a Hamiltonian for these interacting Majoranas coming from three different wires.

$$H_m = -i(\alpha b_1 b_2 + \beta b_2 b_3 + \gamma b_3 b_1) \tag{3.4}$$

Now it is known that Majorana bilinears generate a spin algebra so one would naively think that it is a spin Hamiltonian. But the spin Hamiltonian neither has edge modes nor any topological degeneracy. To understand this one needs to realize that the Clifford algebra generated by Majorana fermions is larger than what is present in equation(3.1). There are other generators of the algebra. Physically the full implications of the parity operator need to be taken into consideration to conceptually complete the algebra.There is a special operator Γ in the algebra which we call as *Emergent Majorana* because it has all the properties of a Majorana fermion.

$$\Gamma \equiv -ib_1 b_2 b_3 \tag{3.5}$$

$$\Gamma^2 = 1 \quad [\Gamma, b_j] = 0 \quad [\Gamma, H_m] = 0 \quad \{\Gamma, P\} = 0 \tag{3.6}$$

The emergent Majorana operator commutes with the Hamiltonian, and hence there is an additional symmetry present, as it anti-commutes with the parity operator and hence it shifts among the parity states. Both the P and Γ operators commute with Hamiltonian but anti-commute with each other due to which there is doubling of the spectrum. The presence of the this extra symmetry leads to the doubled spectrum. This doubling is different from Kramer's doubling[7] because no time reversal symmetry is needed. In the basis in which P is diagonal with ± 1 eigenvalues, the Γ operator takes the states into degenerate eigenstates with eigenvalues ∓ 1.

The doubled spectrum of the Kitaev chain Hamiltonian comes from this algebraic structure which leads to extra symmetries. This algebraic structure is non-perturbative, and hence is robust to perturbations as long as they preserve the discrete symmetry. This algebraic structure survives the interactions also, though there can be dressing of the Majorana operators. So these

properties are present in the Kitaev chain with interactions well. Γ operator can be defined for the interacting chain as well.

4. Topological order and Γ operator

What we have already found is that the complete algebra of Majorana fermions have extra operators which has been called as emergent Majorana fermions and represented by Γ operators. Emergent Majorana fermions have all the properties of the Majorana mode operators and in fact they are more robust to the effects of the environment. That is why it has been proposed to use them for quantum computing[8]. Due to the robustness of emergent Majorana fermions,they have been the focus of research recently [9][10][11][12] where they robustness to envirnonment and to interactions has been studied in detail. Interesting things about emergent Majorana fermions is that they survive interactions as well while as Majorana fermions exist as zero modes of the mean-field(quadractic) Hamiltonians. So it is clear that emergent Majorana fermions have something to do with topological order and in this section we are going to make that connection explicit and rigorous. Though topological order has different definitions we will use the definition as given in [4]. The presence of edge modes is a very important signature of topological order. First we give a definition of fermionic zero mode, and then we will show how that is related to Emergent Majorana fermions or the Gamma operator. A fermionic zero mode is an operator Γ such that

- Commutes with Hamiltonian:$[H, \Gamma] = 0$
- anticommutes with parity:$\{P, \Gamma\} = 0$
- has finite "normalization" even in the $L \to \infty$ limit:$\Gamma^\dagger \Gamma = 1$.

Now we can easily see that the first two properties are the defining properties of the Γ operator and hence are satisfied. Γ, like a Majorana operator, squares to unity and so is always normalized. So our Γ operator satisfies all the properties of the zero edge mode. We will reformulate the conditions in terms of the emergent Majoranas.
A system is said to be topologically ordered if there exists a zero mode which is given by an operator Γ *which is an emergent Majorana fermion and satisfies the above properties.* Therefore topological order is not just the presence of Majorana edge modes, rather it is the presence of emergent Majorana fermion that leads to the topological order in Kitaev Chain.

There are a few things that need to be understood here. Though there is a duality mapping between the spin model and the Fermion model, the algebra and hence the symmetries and observables are not same. On the fermionic side there is larger algebra in which there are extra operators which give rise to topological order while as there are spin analogues of these operators. The Jordan-wigner transformation takes local observables to non-local observables but it cannot give rise to a new algebra or to the gamma operator. The Duality mapping can not find topological order because all it does is

map observables on one side to other observables on other side.

5. Topological order and Yang-Baxter equation

Majorana fermions have been focus of interest in research in topological quantum computaion becuase as shown in [13] [14] that Majorana fermions have non-abelian braid statitics and generate representaion of braid group. Kitaev chain realization of Majorana fermions have given ways to engineer Majorana and there has already been some progress on that front[15].

It has been also realized[16] that the Majorana representation of braid group is different than the ones known in literature. This representation has been called a type-II representation. Now the question which has been asked is that is topological order which arises from quantum entanglement also related to topological entanglement which arises from the solutions of Yang-Baxter equation. Majorana fermions give new solutions to Yang-Baxter equations and hence new type of topological entanglement. When there is topological order we get representation of braid group and also solutions to YBE.

Braiding operators arise from a row of Majorana Fermions $\{\gamma_1, \cdots \gamma_n\}$ as follows: Let

$$\sigma_i = (1/\sqrt{2})(1 + \gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i).$$

Note that if we define

$$\lambda_k = \gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i$$

for $i = 1, \cdots n$ with $\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_1$, then

$$\lambda_i^2 = -1$$

and

$$\lambda_i\lambda_j + \lambda_j\lambda_i = 0$$

where $i \neq j$. From this it is easy to see that

$$\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1}\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}$$

for all i and that $\sigma_i\sigma j = \sigma j\sigma_i$ when $|i - j| > 2$. Thus we have constructed a representation of the Artin braid group from a row of Majorana fermions. This construction is due to Ivanov [14] and he notes that

$$\sigma_i = e^{(\pi/4)\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i}.$$

Mo-Lin Ge [16] makes the further observation that if we define

$$\breve{R}_i(\theta) = e^{\theta\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i},$$

Then $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$ satisfies the full Yang-Baxter equation with rapidity parameter θ. That is, we have the equation

$$\breve{R}_i(\theta_1)\breve{R}_{i+1}(\theta_2)\breve{R}_i(\theta_3) = \breve{R}_{i+1}(\theta_3)\breve{R}_i(\theta_2)\breve{R}_{i+1}(\theta_1).$$

This makes if very clear that $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$ has physical significance, and suggests examining the physical process for a temporal evolution of the unitary operator $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$.

In fact. following [16], we can construct a Kitaev chain based on the solution $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$ of the Yang-Baxter Equation. Let a unitary evolution be governed by $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$. When θ in the unitary operator $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$ is time-dependent, we define a state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ by $|\psi(t)\rangle = \breve{R}_i|\psi(0)\rangle$. With the Schrödinger equation $i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H}(t)|\psi(t)\rangle$ one obtains:

$$i\hbar\tfrac{\partial}{\partial t}[\breve{R}_i|\psi(0)\rangle] = \hat{H}(t)\breve{R}_i|\psi(0)\rangle. \tag{5.1}$$

Then the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_i(t)$ related to the unitary operator $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$ is obtained by the formula:

$$\hat{H}_i(t) = \mathrm{i}\hbar\tfrac{\partial \breve{R}_i}{\partial t}\breve{R}_i^{-1}. \tag{5.2}$$

Substituting $\breve{R}_i(\theta) = \exp(\theta\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i)$ into equation (5.2), we have:

$$\hat{H}_i(t) = \mathrm{i}\hbar\dot{\theta}\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i. \tag{5.3}$$

This Hamiltonian describes the interaction between i-th and $(i+1)$-th sites via the parameter $\dot{\theta}$. When $\theta = n \times \frac{\pi}{4}$, the unitary evolution corresponds to the braiding progress of two nearest Majorana fermion sites in the system as we have described it above. Here n is an integer and signifies the time of the braiding operation. We remark that it is interesting to examine this periodicity of the appearance of the topological phase in the time evolution of this Hamiltonian. For applications, one may consider processes that let the Hamiltonian take the the system right to one of these topological points and then this Hamiltonian cuts off. One may also think of a mode of observation that is tuned in frequency with the appearances of the topological phase.

Mo-Lin Ge points out that if we only consider the nearest-neighbour interactions between Majorana Fermions, and extend equation (5.3) to an inhomogeneous chain with $2N$ sites, the derived model is expressed as:

$$\hat{H} = \mathrm{i}\hbar\sum_{k=1}^{N}(\dot{\theta}_1\gamma_{2k}\gamma_{2k-1} + \dot{\theta}_2\gamma_{2k+1}\gamma_{2k}), \tag{5.4}$$

with $\dot{\theta}_1$ and $\dot{\theta}_2$ describing odd-even and even-odd pairs, respectively.

He then analyzes the above chain model in two cases:

1. $\dot{\theta}_1 > 0$, $\dot{\theta}_2 = 0$.

   In this case, the Hamiltonian is:

   $$\hat{H}_1 = \mathrm{i}\hbar\sum_{k}^{N}\dot{\theta}_1\gamma_{2k}\gamma_{2k-1}. \tag{5.5}$$

   The Majorana operators γ_{2k-1} and γ_{2k} come from the same ordinary fermion site k, $\mathrm{i}\gamma_{2k}\gamma_{2k-1} = 2a_k^\dagger a_k - 1$ ($a_k^\dagger$ and a_k are spinless ordinary fermion operators). $\hat{H}_1$ simply means the total occupancy of ordinary

fermions in the chain and has U(1) symmetry, $a_j \to e^{i\phi}a_j$. Specifically, when $\theta_1(t) = \frac{\pi}{4}$, the unitary evolution $e^{\theta_1\gamma_{2k}\gamma_{2k-1}}$ corresponds to the braiding operation of two Majorana sites from the same k-th ordinary fermion site. The ground state represents the ordinary fermion occupation number 0. In comparison to 1D Kitaev model, this Hamiltonian corresponds to the trivial case of Kitaev's. This Hamiltonian is described by the intersecting lines above the dashed line, where the intersecting lines correspond to interactions. The unitary evolution of the system $e^{-i\int \hat{H}_1 dt}$ stands for the exchange process of odd-even Majorana sites.

2. $\dot{\theta}_1 = 0$, $\dot{\theta}_2 > 0$.
   In this case, the Hamiltonian is:

$$\hat{H}_2 = \mathrm{i}\hbar \sum_k^N \dot{\theta}_2 \gamma_{2k+1}\gamma_{2k}. \tag{5.6}$$

This Hamiltonian corresponds to the topological phase of 1D Kitaev model and has $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, $a_j \to -a_j$. Here the operators γ_1 and γ_{2N} are absent in $\hat{H}_2$. The Hamiltonian has two degenerate ground state, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = d^\dagger|0\rangle$, $d^\dagger = e^{-i\varphi/2}(\gamma_1 - i\gamma_{2N})/2$. This mode is the so-called Majorana mode in 1D Kitaev chain model. When $\theta_2(t) = \frac{\pi}{4}$, the unitary evolution $e^{\theta_2\gamma_{2k+1}\gamma_{2k}}$ corresponds to the braiding operation of two Majorana sites γ_{2k} and γ_{2k+1} from k-th and $(k+1)$-th ordinary fermion sites, respectively.

Thus the Hamiltonian derived from $\breve{R}_i(\theta(t))$ corresponding to the braiding of nearest Majorana fermion sites is exactly the same as the $1D$ wire proposed by Kitaev, and $\dot{\theta}_1 = \dot{\theta}_2$ corresponds to the phase transition point in the "superconducting" chain. By choosing different time-dependent parameter θ_1 and θ_2, one finds that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ corresponds to different phases. These observations of Mo-Lin Ge give physical substance and significance to the Majorana Fermion braiding operators discovered by Ivanov [14], putting them into a robust context of Hamiltonian evolution via the simple Yang-Baxterization $\breve{R}_i(\theta) = e^{\theta\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i}$. Ge makes another observation, that we wish to point out. In [17], Kauffman and Lomonaco observe that the Bell Basis Change Matrix in the quantum information context is a solution to the Yang-Baxter equation. Remarkably this solution can be seen as a 4×4 matrix representation for the operator $\breve{R}_i(\theta)$.

This lets one can ask whether there is relation between topological order and quantum entanglement and braiding [17] which is the case for the Kitaev chain where non-local Majorana modes are entangled and also braiding.

The Bell-Basis Matrix B_{II} is given as follows:

$$B_{II} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(I + M\big) \quad \big(M^2 = -1\big) \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$M_i M_{i\pm1} = -M_{i\pm1} M_i, \quad M^2 = -I, \tag{5.8}$$

$$M_i M_j = M_j M_i, \quad \big|i - j\big| \geq 2. \tag{5.9}$$

Remarks. The operators M_i take the place here of the products of Majorana Fermions $\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i$ in the Ivanov picture of braid group representation in the form

$$\sigma_i = (1/\sqrt{2})(1 + \gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i).$$

This observation of Mo-Lin Ge gives a concrete interpretation of these braiding operators and relates them to a Hamiltonian for the physical system. This goes beyond the work of Ivanov, who examines the representation on Majoranas obtained by conjugating by these operators. The Ivanov representation is of order two, while this representation is of order eight. The reader may wish to compare this remark with the contents of [18] where we associate Majorana fermions with elementary periodic processes. These processes can be regarded as prior to the periodic process associated with the Hamiltonian of Mo-Lin Ge. Clearly there is much more to explore in this domain.

5.1. Topological order and topological entanglement

To understand the relation between quantum entanglement in Kitaev chain and the corresponding topological entanglement which manifests as braid group representation,we point out that *it is only in the topological phase of the Kitaev chain braid group representation arises while as in topologically trivial phase there are no Majorana edge modes and hence no braid representation.* To see this relation mathematically,we rewrite the Kitaev chain Hamiltonian corresponding to topological phase.

$$H = 2it \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \gamma_{1,i+1}\gamma_{2,i} \tag{5.10}$$

and now find out that for Majorana representation as shown by Ivanov we need the operator of the form $1+\gamma_{i+1}\gamma_i$ which arises only in topological phase. So this brings out the relation between topological order and the topological entanglement(braiding).

Using this relation We give new charecterization of topological order. *A system is said to be topological ordered if it also gives solution to Yang-Baxter equation.* This is true both for Kitaev chain and its parafermion generalization. In both cases there are edge modes which give solution to Yang-Baxter equation.

6. Summary

In this paper we answer the question of how topological order and Landau order are related in context of Kitaev p-wave chain. We show that on fermionic side there are extra symmetries and particularly we identify γ operator which is needed to have topological order. The same gamma operator was shown to lead to doubled spectrum for the Kitaev chain Hamiltonian. It is interesting to note that the γ operator which we have used to define topological order has same algebraic properties as Ψ operator which Fendley has defined. Our construction can be easily generalized to parafermion case as well. We have also shown how non-locality of Majorana fermions(quantum entangelemt) is related to topological entangelent which arises for the solutions of Yang-Baxter equation.Since understanding topological order is very important not only for the topological quantum computation rather is is also very important within condensed matter physics where more and more systems are being discovered which exhibit topological order. In that direction our work is very important because it clearly shows how topological order occurs when there are more symmetries and larger algebra.

7. Acknowledgements

Rukhsan-Ul-Haq would like to thank Professor N.S. Vidhyadhiraja for various discussions related to this work and also for facilitating the academic visit to IISER Pune where the authors had many fruitful discussions about this work. He also would like to thank Department of Science and Technology, India for the funding and JNCASR Bangalore for all the facilities. The feedback of Professors Gerardo Ortiz and Zohar Nussinov is highly appreciated.

References

[1] A. Kitaev,Phys. Usp.**44**,131(2001)
[2] M. Greiter,V.Schnells and R. Thomale, Annals of Physics **351**,1026(2014)
[3] E. Cobanera,G. Ortiz and Z. Nussinov,Phys. Rev. B. **87**,0411705(2013)
[4] P. Fendley,J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **49**(2016)
[5] J. Lee and F. Wilczek,Phys. Rev.Lett.**111**,226402(2013)
[6] Rukhsan Ul Haq,Resonance,Vol. 21,**12**(2016)
[7] B.A. Bernevig,*Topological Insulators and Toplogical Superconductors* (Princeton University Press,Princeton)(2013)
[8] A.R. Akhmerov,Phys. Rev. B **82**,020509(2010)
[9] G. Goldstein and C. Chamon,Phys. Rev. B**86**,115122(2010)
[10] Guang Yang and D.E. Feldman,Phys. Rev B**89**,035136(2014)
[11] G. Kells,Phys. Rev. B**92**,081401(2015)
[12] H. Katsura,D. Schuricht and M. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. B **92**,115137(2015)
[13] G. Moore and N. Read,Nucl. Phys. B **360**,362(1991)
[14] D.A. Ivanov,Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**,268(2001)

[15] V. Mourik *et al*,Science **336**,1003(2012)

[16] Li-Wei Yu and Mo-Lin Ge,Sci. Rep.**5**,8102(2015)

[17] L.H.Kauffman and S.J.Lomonaco,New. J.Phys.**4**,73(2002)

[18] L. H. Kauffman. Knot logic and topological quantum computing with Majorana fermions. In "Logic and algebraic structures in quantum computing and information", Lecture Notes in Logic, J. Chubb, J. Chubb, Ali Eskandarian, and V. Harizanov, editors, 124 pages Cambridge University Press (2016).

Rukhsan Ul Haq
Theoretical Sciences Unit,
Jawaharlal Nehru Center for Advanced Scientific Research
Jakkur Bangalore India
e-mail: mrhaq@jncasr.ac.in

Louis H. Kauffman
Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science
University of Illinios
Chicago USA.
e-mail: kauffman@uic.edu